



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/123,430	07/28/1998	DONALD L. YATES	M4065.073/P0	5528

7590 02/26/2002

THOMAS J D AMICO
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN AND OSHINSKY
2101 L STREET N W
WASHINGTON, DC 200371526

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

KEBEDE, BROOK

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2823

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/123,430	YATES, DONALD L.
	Examiner Brook Kebede	Art Unit 2823

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-27,52,58 and 60-77 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 13,23,52,58,65,66,72 and 73 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-22,24-27,58,60-64,67-71 and 74-77 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 11, 2002 in Paper No. 24 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 14, 17-20, 24, 26, 44, 61, 68, 75, 76 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishizawa et al., (USPAT/5,275,184).

Re claim 1, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for removing surface contaminants from air/liquid interface of a semiconductor processing bath for processing semiconductor wafers the method comprising rapidly removing an upper portion semiconductor processing fluid present in the bath while the wafers are in the bath (see Fig. 2 and Col. 2, lines 62-67 through Col. 5, lines 1-27).

Re claims 2 and 3, as applied to claim 1 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations including the limitation wherein the semiconductor process bath as an etching/cleaning bath (see Fig. 2 and abstract).

Re claim 5, as applied to claim 1 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations including the limitation wherein the semiconductor process bath as an etching bath (see Fig. 2 and abstract).

Re claim 6, as applied to claim 1 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations including the limitation wherein the contaminants include silica (see Fig. 2).

Re claim 7, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for reducing the contamination on a semiconductor wafer from wet etching bath comprising: processing the semiconductor wafer in the wet etching bath containing and etching fluid; subsequently rapidly removing an upper portion of the etching fluid from the wet etching bath to remove surface contaminants form an air/liquid interface of the wet etching bath while retaining the semiconductor wafer in the etching bath and subsequently removing of the wafer from the bath (see Fig. 2 and related text in Col. 2, lines 62-67 through Col. 5, lines 1-27; Col. 20, lines 7-14).

Re claim 8, as applied to claim 7 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations including the limitation wherein substantial etching fluid (see Fig 2 and related text in Col. 3, lines 17-23).

Re claim 9, as applied to claim 8 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations including the limitation wherein the upper portion of the etching fluid is removed by draining a top portion of the etching fluid from wet etching bath (see Fig. 2 and related text in Col. 7, lines 2-14).

Re claim 14, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for removing contaminants from an air/liquid interface of a semiconductor processing bath for processing semiconductor wafers the method comprising: rapidly removing an upper portion of a semiconductor processing fluid

Art Unit: 2823

present in the bath while the wafers are in the bath by rapidly removing a wafer boat containing the semiconductor wafer from the bath to remove the surface contaminants from air/liquid interface (see Fig. 2).

Re claim 17, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for etching a semiconductor wafer the method comprising: placing and etching fluid into a wet etching vessel; placing the semiconductor fluid into wet etching fluid; contacting the semiconductor wafer with the etching fluid for period or time; rapidly removing a portion of the etching fluid from the upper surface of wet etching vessel while keeping the semiconductor wafer immersed in the etching fluid (see Fig. 2, and related text in Col. 2, lines 62-67 through Col. 5, lines 1-27; Col. 20, lines 7-14).

Re claim 18 as applied to claim 17 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations including the limitation wherein the semiconductor is a silicon wafer (see abstract)

Re claim 19 as applied to claim 18 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations including the limitation wherein the etching fluid is an aqueous HF solution (see related text in Col. 11, lines 18-20).

Re claim 20, as applied to claim 17 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations including the limitation wherein the etching fluid is removed from an upper surface of the wet etching vessel by draining of the top portion of the etching fluid from the wet etching vessel (see Fig. 2 and related text in Col. 7, lines 2-14).

Re claim 24, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for etching a semiconductor wafer the method comprising: placing and etching fluid into a wet etching vessel; placing the semiconductor fluid into wet etching fluid; contacting the semiconductor wafer with the etching fluid for period or time; rapidly removing a portion of the etching fluid from the upper surface of

Art Unit: 2823

wet etching vessel by rapidly removing a wafer boat containing the semiconductor wafers from the wet etching vessel (see Fig. 2).

Re claim 26, as applied to claim 17 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations including the limitation wherein the etching fluid is removed from the upper surface of the wet etching vessel by physically removing a top portion of the etching fluid from the wet etching bath (see Fig. 2).

Re claim 44, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for etching a semiconductor wafer the method comprising: immersing a wafer boat in an etching vessel having an etching fluid therein for sufficient time to etch the silicon wafer; and rapidly removing the wafer boat from the etching vessel to remove the contaminants residing on the upper surface of the etching fluid by causing the etching fluid to spill out of the vessel (see Fig. 2).

Re claim 61, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for removing surface contaminants from an air/liquid interface of a semiconductor processing bath for processing semiconductor wafers, said method comprising: rapidly removing an upper portion of a semiconductor processing fluid present in said bath, while said wafers are in said bath, to permit flow of said upper portion of said processing fluid and thereby break eddy currents holding said surface contaminants at said air/liquid interface (see Fig. 2).

Re claim 68, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for removing surface contaminants from an air/liquid interface of a semiconductor processing bath for processing semiconductor wafers, said method comprising: rapidly removing an upper portion of a semiconductor processing fluid present in said bath, to permit flow of said upper portion of said processing fluid and thereby

Art Unit: 2823

while said wafers are in said bath, to break surface tension forces holding said surface contaminants at said air/liquid interface (see Fig. 2).

Re claim 75, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for reducing the contamination on a semiconductor wafer from a wet etching bath comprising: processing said semiconductor wafer in said wet etching bath containing an etching fluid; subsequently breaking eddy currents of said wet etching bath by rapidly removing an upper portion of said etching fluid from said wet etching bath, said act of breaking said eddy currents further releasing surface contaminants which are formed at an air/liquid interface of said wet etching bath and held at said air/liquid interface by said eddy currents; and subsequently removing said semiconductor wafer from said wet etching bath (see Fig. 2).

Re claim 76, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for reducing the contamination on a semiconductor wafer from a wet etching bath comprising processing said semiconductor wafer in said wet etching bath containing an etching fluid; subsequently breaking surface tension forces of said wet etching bath by rapidly removing an upper portion of said etching fluid from said wet etching bath, said act of breaking said surface tension forces further releasing surface contaminants which are formed at an air/liquid interface of said wet etching bath and held at said air/liquid interface by said eddy currents; and subsequently removing said semiconductor wafer from said wet etching bath (see Fig. 2).

Re claim 77, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for reducing the contamination on a semiconductor wafer, said method comprising: processing said semiconductor wafer in a static etching bath containing an etching fluid; and rapidly removing an upper portion of said etching fluid while said semiconductor wafer is in said static etching bath (see Fig. 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 10, 27, 62, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Nishizawa et al., USPAT/5,275,184 in view of Itoh et al., USPAT/5,795,401.

Re claim 10, Nishizawa et al. teach all the limitation in the claimed limitations as applied in claim 7 except the use of paddle to remove the fluid from the top portion of the etching process bath.

Itoh et al. disclose the use of back paddle to jet (remove) out the wash fluid during process of cleaning of semiconductor substrate (see related text in Col. 10, lines 18-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with paddle as taught by Itoh et al. because the use of paddle would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath.

Re claim 27, Nishizawa et al. teach all the limitation in the claimed invention as applied in claim 26 except the use of paddle to remove the fluid from the top portion of the etching process bath.

Itoh et al. disclose the use of back paddle to jet (remove) out the wash fluid during process of cleaning of semiconductor substrate (see related text in Col. 10, lines 18-48).



Art Unit: 2823

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with paddle as taught by Itoh et al. because the use of paddle would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath.

Re claim 62, as applied to claim 61 above, Nishizawa et al. teach all the limitation in the claimed limitations as applied in claim 7 except the use of paddle to remove the fluid from the top portion of the etching process bath.

Itoh et al. disclose the use of back paddle to jet (remove) out the wash fluid during process of cleaning of semiconductor substrate (see related text in Col. 10, lines 18-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with paddle as taught by Itoh et al. because the use of paddle would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath.

Re claim 69, as applied to claim 68 above, Nishizawa et al. teach all the limitation in the claimed limitations as applied in claim 7 except the use of paddle to remove the fluid from the top portion of the etching process bath.

Itoh et al. disclose the use of back paddle to jet (remove) out the wash fluid during process of cleaning of semiconductor substrate (see related text in Col. 10, lines 18-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with paddle as taught by Itoh et al. because the use of paddle would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath.



Art Unit: 2823

6. Claims 11, 21, 63 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishizawa et al., USPAT/5,275,184 in view of Mohindra et al., USPAT/5,958,146.

Re claim 11, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for removing contaminants from a semiconductor processing bath for processing semiconductor wafers the method comprising: rapidly removing an upper portion of a semiconductor processing fluid presented in the bath, while the wafer in the bath (see Fig. 2). However, Nishizawa et al. do not mention use of valve to remove the etching fluid.

Mohindra et al. disclose the use of valve to remove during cleaning (etching) process of the semiconductor wafer (see related text in Col. 3, lines 56-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with a valve as taught by Mohindra et al. because the use of valve would have provided another method of removing contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath when the valve opens by mechanical means.

Re claim 21, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for etching a semiconductor wafer the method comprising: placing an etching fluid into a wet etching vessel; placing the semiconductor wafer in the etching fluid; contacting the semiconductor wafer with the etching fluid for a period of time; and rapidly removing a portion of the etching fluid from the upper surface of the wet etching vessel (see Fig. 2). Although, the process is inherent, Nishizawa et al. do not mention use of valve to remove the etching fluid.

Mohindra et al. disclose the use of valve to remove during cleaning (etching) process of the semiconductor wafer (see related text in Col. 3, lines 56-60).

Art Unit: 2823

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with a valve as taught by Mohindra et al. because the use of valve would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath when the valve opens by mechanical means.

Re claim 63, as applied to claim 61 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations except the use of valve.

Mohindra et al. disclose the use of valve to remove during cleaning (etching) process of the semiconductor wafer (see related text in Col. 3, lines 56-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with a valve as taught by Mohindra et al. because the use of valve would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath when the valve opens by mechanical means.

Re claim 70, as applied to claim 68 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations except the use of valve.

Mohindra et al. disclose the use of valve to remove during cleaning (etching) process of the semiconductor wafer (see related text in Col. 3, lines 56-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with a valve as taught by Mohindra et al. because the use of valve would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath when the valve opens by mechanical means.

Art Unit: 2823

7. Claims 12, 15, 22, 25, 64, 67, 71 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishizawa et al. (USPAT/5,275,184) in view of Hayami et al. (USPAT/5,474,616).

Re claim 12, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method of removing contaminants from a semiconductor processing bath for processing semiconductor wafers the method comprising: rapidly removing an upper portion of a semiconductor processing fluid present in the bath, while the wafers are in the bath (see Fig. 2). However, Nishizawa et al. do not disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by hingedly releasing a door located at an upper portion of the bath.

Hayami et al. disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by hingedly releasing a door located at an upper portion of the bath (see Fig. 41 and 42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with a hingedly released door as taught by Hayami et al. because the use of the door would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath when the door opened.

Re claim 15, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method of removing contaminants from a semiconductor processing bath for processing semiconductor wafers the method comprising: rapidly removing an upper portion of a semiconductor processing fluid present in the bath, while the wafers are in the bath (see Fig. 2). However, Nishizawa et al. do not disclose removing a

Art Unit: 2823

portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by telescopically collapsing sidewalls of the vessel containing the bath.

Hayami et al. disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by telescopically collapsing sidewalls of the vessel containing the bath. (see Fig. 41 and 42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with a hingedly released door as taught by Hayami et al. because the use of telescopically collapsing sidewalls would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath when the sidewall folded.

Re claim 22, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for etching a semiconductor wafer the method comprising: placing an etching fluid into a wet etching vessel; placing the semiconductor fluid into wet etching fluid; contacting the semiconductor wafer with the etching fluid for period or time; rapidly removing a portion of the etching fluid from the upper surface of wet etching vessel while keeping the semiconductor wafer immersed in the etching fluid (see Fig. 2, and related text in Col. 2, lines 62-67 through Col. 5, lines 1-27; Col. 20, lines 7-14). However, Nishizawa et al. do not disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by hingedly releasing a door located at an upper portion of the bath.

Hayami et al. disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by hingedly releasing a door located at an upper portion of the bath (see Fig. 41 and 42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with a hingedly released door as taught by Hayami et al. because the use of the door would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath when the door opened.

Re claim 25, Nishizawa et al. disclose a method for etching a semiconductor wafer the method comprising: placing and etching fluid into a wet etching vessel; placing the semiconductor fluid into wet etching fluid; contacting the semiconductor wafer with the etching fluid for period or time; rapidly removing a portion of the etching fluid from the upper surface of wet etching vessel at a non-constant velocity while keeping the semiconductor wafer immersed in the etching fluid (see Fig. 2, and related text in Col. 2, lines 62-67 through Col. 5, lines 1-27; Col. 20, lines 7-14). However, Nishizawa et al. do not disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by telescopically collapsing sidewalls of the vessel containing the bath.

Hayami et al. disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by telescopically collapsing sidewalls of the vessel containing the bath. (see Fig. 41 and 42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with a hingedly released door as taught by Hayami et al. because the use of telescopically collapsing sidewalls would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath when the sidewall folded.

Re claim 64, as applied to claim 61 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitation. However, Nishizawa et al. do not disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by hingedly releasing a door located at an upper portion of the bath.

Hayami et al. disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by hingedly releasing a door located at an upper portion of the bath (see Fig. 41 and 42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with a hingedly released door as taught by Hayami et al. because the use of the door would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath when the door opened.

Re claim 67, as applied to claim 61 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations. However, Nishizawa et al. do not disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by telescopically collapsing sidewalls of the vessel containing the bath.

Hayami et al. disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by telescopically collapsing sidewalls of the vessel containing the bath. (see Fig. 41 and 42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with a hingedly released door as taught by Hayami et al. because the use of telescopically collapsing

Art Unit: 2823

sidewalls would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath when the sidewall folded.

Re claim 71, as applied to claim 68 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitation. However, Nishizawa et al. do not disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by hingedly releasing a door located at an upper portion of the bath.

Hayami et al. disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by hingedly releasing a door located at an upper portion of the bath (see Fig. 41 and 42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with a hingedly released door as taught by Hayami et al. because the use of the door would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath when the door opened.

Re claim 74, as applied to claim 68 above, Nishizawa et al. disclose all the claimed limitations. However, Nishizawa et al. do not disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by telescopically collapsing sidewalls of the vessel containing the bath.

Hayami et al. disclose removing a portion of the etching fluid from upper surface of the etching bath, by telescopically collapsing sidewalls of the vessel containing the bath. (see Fig. 41 and 42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided Nishizawa et al. reference with a hingedly released door as taught by Hayami et al. because the use of telescopically collapsing sidewalls would have provided removing of contaminants from the top of the wafer etching bath when the sidewall folded.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 13, 23, 52, 58, 65, 66, 72 and 73 are allowed over prior art of record.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 61-77 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The amendment filed on July 18, 2001 in Paper No. 19 includes the newly added claims, i.e. claims 61-73. Since these newly added claims contained new issue that was not presented in the prior amendments, applicants argument is considered moot in view of the new grounds(s) of rejection.

Regarding claims 1-3, 5-9, 14, 17-20, 24, 26 and 44, applicants argued that "Nishizawa does not disclose any of the claimed invention."

In response to the applicants' argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that such an argument is not commensurate with the scope of the claims, in particular, as stated above. Nishizawa et al. anticipate all the claimed limitation as set forth herein above in Paragraph No. 2. The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-9, 14, 17-20, 24, 26 and 44 under 35 USC 102 is deemed proper.

Regarding claims 10 and 27, applicants argued that "the references are not combinable in view of diverse area involved in each reference."

Art Unit: 2823

In response to the applicants' argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that such an argument is not commensurate with the scope of the claims, in particular, as stated above. Nishizawa et al. and Itoh et al. in combination anticipate all the claimed limitation as set forth herein above in Paragraph No. 4. The rejection of claims 10 and 27 under 35 USC 103 is deemed proper. Furthermore, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Regarding claims 11 and 21, applicants argued that "the control valve in Mohindra is not used to remove any portion of an etching fluid..."

In response to the applicants' argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that such an argument is not commensurate with the scope of the claims, in particular, as stated above. Nishizawa et al. and Mohindra et al. in combination anticipate all the claimed limitation as set forth herein above in Paragraph No. 5. The rejection of claims 11 and 21 under 35 USC 103 is deemed proper. In response to applicants' argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicants' disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Art Unit: 2823

Regarding claims 12, 15, 22 and 25, applicants argued that “the references are not combinable in view of diverse area involved in each reference...”

In response to the applicants’ argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that such an argument is not commensurate with the scope of the claims, in particular, as stated above. Nishizawa et al. and Mohindra et al. in combination anticipate all the claimed limitation as set forth herein above in Paragraph No. 6. The rejection of claims 11 and 21 under 35 USC 103 is deemed proper. Furthermore, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Conclusion

10. This Office action is **made NON-FINAL**.

Correspondence

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brook Kebede whose telephone number is (703) 306-4511. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 Monday to Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (703) 308-4918. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2823

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Brook Kebede

bk
February 23, 2002


**SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**